SBC Midwest Repair Coding Accuracy
Management Review Results
January 1, 2004 – March 31, 2004

I. Background

In reporting the results of its OSS testing conducted within the five-state SBC Midwest region, BearingPoint originally determined that SBC had failed to meet a 95% accuracy benchmark for trouble ticket closure coding for reported trouble on UNE circuits in Michigan, and for Special circuits in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan and Ohio. To address this issue, SBC Midwest developed a Repair Coding Accuracy Plan ("the Plan"), which detailed several initiatives the Company would implement to improve upon the accuracy of the coding used on trouble ticket closures. One of those initiatives entailed ongoing management reviews of the coding applied by various work center staff on a monthly or bi-monthly sample of closed tickets. The Plan called for SBC to provide each state commission with a quarterly report of the results of these management reviews and any corrective actions taken to address any shortcomings identified.

SBC Midwest published its first quarterly report (for reviews conducted between April 1, 2003 and June 30, 2003) on July 31, 2003. That report not only provided a summary of the results of the reviews being conducted by the three SBC Midwest organizations directly involved in trouble ticket coding (i.e., the Local Operations Center ("LOC"), the Installation and Repair Centers ("I&R"), and the Special Services Test Centers ("SSTC")), but also provided a detailed description of the processes employed in conducting the reviews.

In addition to the internal reviews conducted by SBC, the Plan had also described the third-party verification procedure, which included both an examination of a sampling of actual UNE and Special circuit closures by an independent third-party evaluator, as well as a third-party verification of the completion of the Plan's initiatives. Similar to SBC's reporting requirement, the Plan called for the third-party evaluator, BearingPoint, to provide a final report of its examination to the commissions shortly after the completion of its analysis.

BearingPoint published its final Third Party Examination Results report on September 18, 2003. That report showed that SBC Midwest had exceeded the Plan's target accuracy level for samples of both circuit categories, and verified that the Plan's initiatives had been met.[1]

II. Purpose

In the following section, SBC summarizes the results obtained from the management reviews conducted during the 1st Quarter of 2004 and corrective actions taken to address any shortcomings.

[1] SBC Midwest notes that the one remaining action item, the reporting of management review results that continue until April 2006, is not fully complete due to the nature of the implementation requirement. BearingPoint did, however, verify that this action item is currently underway.

SBC Midwest Repair Coding Accuracy
Management Review Results
January 1, 2004 – March 31, 2004

III. Summary Results

The results of the management reviews in each of the three work groups are summarized in the following table.

Trouble Ticket Coding Accuracy Reviews
– January, February, March 2004

Work Center	Quantity of Tickets Reviewed	Quantity of Correct Closures	Percentage Accurate%	Corrective Actions Taken
SSTC				
• **January Specials**	68	65	95.5%	
• **February Specials**	60	59	98.3%	
• **March Specials**	50	49	98.0%	
LOC*				
• **UNE-P**	1453	1293	89.0%	Note 1
• **UNE-L**	3394	3156	93.0%	Note 1
I & R				
• **January UNE**	1980	26	98.7%	
• **February UNE**	1906	14	99.3%	
• **March UNE**	2690	118	95.6%	

* Results from the bi-monthly review (February 2004).

Notes:

1) Although there is continued improvement over previous internal results for trouble ticket closures, UNE-P closure errors continue to occur primarily due to misapplication of two similar disposition codes, 1134 and 1131 and their accompanying cause code. These codes are used solely on tickets opened when a UNE-P CLEC calls for information only. Although analysis shows that misses are attributable to only a small number of LOC service reps, reinforcement of the proper use of these codes is being re-addressed with the entire team via awareness sessions and coaching from the management team. Need for continued targeted awareness training will continue to be monitored. As in the past, no common trends have been identified for UNE-L errors, e.g., recurring incorrect codes and/or the same individuals responsible for the errors.